

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested on the basis of the following particulars:

Objection to the Specification

With respect to the title “Electroluminescent Display” not being descriptive, Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner to a few examples of issued patents with succinct titles, such as US 7,781,966 (“Electroluminescent Display”), and US 7,750,873 (“Electroluminescent display device”). In view of the allowance of such succinct and descriptive titles, Applicant respectfully request the present title of the present application be left as is.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

With respect to the rejection of claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sack (US 2,922,076) and Cantarano (US 3,890,039) in view of Richie (US 5,821,691), Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection at least for the reason that Sack, Cantarano and Richie, combined or separately, fail to teach, disclose, or suggest all of the limitation recited in the rejected claims.

In summary, claim 1 was previously amended to further clarify the rear electrode layer as a whole being situated in the recess and electrically isolated by the insulating layer to overcome Sack and Cantarano, which were applied in the obviousness rejection detailed in the Office Action dated March 9, 2010. In the pending rejection, Richie is applied as curing the deficiencies of Sack and Cantarano. The Examiner cites col. 5, lines 1-30 and Fig. 5 as showing an electroluminescent panel 50 including front electrode, and rear electrodes 73,93 as whole situated in the recess formed by the insulating layer 77, 97 and are electrically isolated. The Examiner further contends that it would be obvious to modify the rear electrodes 26 of Sack such that they are situated as a whole in the recess and electrically isolated by

the insulation layer 28 of Sack and Cantarano as suggested by Richie for preventing unintended connections and etc.

In response to the newly applied reference to Richie, Applicant respectfully asserts that, when Richie is read in proper and full context, Richie does not teach, disclose, or suggest the rear electrode layer as a whole being situated in the recess and electrically isolated by the insulating layer as recited in Applicant's claimed invention. Further, there is no suggestion or motivation to modify Richie to combine its teaching with Sack and Cantarano. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Fig. 5 and col. 5 of Richie should be read in conjunction with its Fig. 4 and the description in col. 4 to fully understand the features cited by the Examiner. That is, when read in proper and full context, the inappropriateness of the reliance on Richie as a secondary reference would be apparent.

Richie generally shows a back electrode comprising several parts which are isolated from each other partially by an isolation layer. However, this isolation layer does not serve primarily to separate individual (single) parts of the back electrode, but rather to isolate an electric bridge, which is a layer above the isolation layer, such as described in col. 4, lines 27-62 of Richie as follows:

FIG. 4 is a cross-section of an EL panel constructed in accordance with another aspect of the invention. Transparent substrate 51 is a sheet of polyester or polycarbonate having transparent front electrode 52 deposited thereon. Phosphor layer 55 overlies front electrode 52 and dielectric layer 56 overlies phosphor layer 55. The front electrode is completely covered and the rear electrode is split into two or more electrodes. That is, the conductive layer overlying dielectric layer 56 is patterned to produce a plurality of rear electrodes. An AC voltage applied to one rear electrode is capacitively coupled by the front electrode to another rear electrode.

Rear electrode 57 and rear electrode 58 are separated by gap 59 for defining a suitable graphic. Insulating layer 61 overlies a portion of dielectric layer 56, a portion of rear electrode 57, and fills a portion of gap 59, forming an insulating bridge between rear electrode 58 and conductive layer 62. Conductive layer 62 overlies dielectric layer 56 and extends along the length of panel 50, into the plane of FIG. 4.

Bus bar 65 and bus bar 67, which preferably are made from a silver bearing ink or a copper laminate, overlie rear electrode 57 and conductive layer 62 at opposite edges of panel 50. The lamps in panel 50 are lit by applying an AC voltage across bus bars 65 and 67. If a plurality of lamps are defined by the patterned rear electrode, then all of the lamps are lit simultaneously if they are coupled to the buses by suitable bridges.

Area 68, which is an extension of front electrode 52, indicates an optional construction in which there is both a patterned rear electrode and a rear connection to the front electrode, as illustrated in FIG. 1. For connection to front electrode 52, bus bar 67 is coupled to the front electrode by a conductive layer (not shown) and all of the areas of the patterned rear electrode are connected to bus bar 65, either directly or by conductive bridges.

In addition, the isolation layers 77 and 97 are not connected to each other but only bridge the surface of the electroluminescent element between the bus bar and electrode 73 and 93, respectively. Further, the back electrode in Fig. 4 of Richie comprises several discrete parts which are only partially filled by the isolation layer 61, whereas a further recess 59 exists in which no isolation layer is situated.

In view of the teachings of Richie, Applicant respectfully asserts that one skilled in the art would not be motivated to modify Richie in order to combine its teaching with Sack and Cantarano to modify the back electrode in such a way that it is completely situated in the recess and separated by an isolation layer from other parts of the electrode.

In view of the arguments set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claims 1-14.

Accordingly, it is requested that claims 1-14 be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the Applicant's representative, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown.

Further, while no fees are believed to be due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-4525.

Respectfully submitted,

/Donald R. Studebaker/
Donald R. Studebaker
Registration No. 32,815

Studebaker & Brackett PC
One Fountain Square
11911 Freedom Drive
Suite 750
Reston, Virginia 20190
(703) 390-9051
Fax: (703) 390-1277
don.studebaker@sbpatentlaw.com